

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action dated October 30, 2007, setting forth a shortened three month statutory period for reply expiring on January 30, 2008. This Response is being filed within two months of the final Office Action, and accordingly an Advisory Action is respectfully requested. Because December 30, 2007 was a Sunday, a response filed by December 31, 2007 is within the two month period 37 C.F.R. 1.7.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 13-22 were pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11 and 14 being independent claims. In brief review, the Examiner requested correction of Fig. 2, and objected to claim 6 as having an informality. The Examiner rejected claim 11 and its dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for use of the phrase "wherein the pull-down transistor has one end coupled with the floating current mirror." The Examiner rejected claims 6-9 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,064,601 to Kwak et al (hereinafter Kwak). The Examiner rejected claim 14 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,204,724 to Kobatake (hereinafter Kobatake).

The Examiner indicated that "claims 1-5 and 21 are presently allowed" and that claims 11, 13, 15-20 and 22 would be allowable if they comply with Section 112, 2nd paragraph. (See Office Action, at p. 8, Sections 10-11)

By this amendment, claims 6-9 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice. Hence, claims 1-3, 5, 21, and 11, 13, 15-20, 22 (with claims 1 and 11 being independent claims) remain in the application and are all believed to be allowable.

RESPONSE TO DRAWING OBJECTION

Fig. 2 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as allegedly needing to show a "pull-down transistor coupled with the floating current mirror" as recited in claim 11 (See Office Action at p. 2, Section 3). This objection is respectfully traversed because Fig. 2 already shows this feature of claim 11.

Fig. 2 shows pull-down transistor M3 coupled with the floating current mirror 42, which in the example of Fig. 2 includes transistors M5 and M4. Pull-down transistor M3 has its gate coupled with the drain of transistor M5 of the current mirror, and therefore for at least this

reason Fig. 2 shows a "pull-down transistor coupled with the floating current mirror" as recited in claim 11.

Also, it is noted that Fig. 3 illustrates another embodiment of the invention, and in Fig. 3 pull-down transistor M23 is coupled with the floating current mirror (M25 and M24 in this example) through protection transistor M26. Moreover, the gate of pull-down transistor M23 is also coupled with the drain of transistor M25 of the current mirror. Hence, Fig. 3 shows a "pull-down transistor coupled with the floating current mirror" as recited in claim 11.

Hence, for at least these reasons, it is believed that the drawings satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.83(a) and it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Independent claim 11 and dependent claims 13, 15-20 and 22 were rejected as under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for use of the phrase "wherein the pull-down transistor has one end coupled with the floating current mirror." The Examiner stated that this feature is supposedly "misdescriptive" and "is not shown in Fig. 2" because "since the pull-down transistor [M3] is coupled to the gate of an intervening transistor [M6], there can be no conductive path to the floating current mirror [M4 and M5]; thus, the pull-down transistor [M3] is not coupled to the floating current mirror [M4 and M5]." (Office Action, pages 3-4, Section 5).

This indefiniteness rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 recites in part a pull-down transistor that "has one end coupled with the floating current mirror." Fig. 3 illustrates an embodiment of the invention where pull-down transistor M23 has its drain coupled with the floating current mirror (M25 and M24 in this example) through protection transistor M26. The Examiner states that the "ordinary meaning of the word 'coupled' would require that there be a conductive path" between the pull-down transistor and the floating current mirror. (See Office Action, at p. 7). It is respectfully submitted that Fig. 3 shows a pull-down transistor that "has one end coupled with the floating current mirror" as recited in claim 11, and therefore claim 11 is not mis-descriptive.

Accordingly, it is believed that claims 11, 13, 15-20 and 22 are definite in that they particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of this embodiment of the claimed

Appl. No. 10/796,859
Amendment dated December 31, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 30, 2007

invention, and are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully requested that the indefiniteness rejection be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner rejected claims 6-9 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,064,601 to Kwak et al (hereinafter Kwak). The Examiner rejected claim 14 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,204,724 to Kobatake (hereinafter Kobatake).

By this Amendment, claims 6-9 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims 6-9 and 14 in a continuation application. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicated that "claims 1-5 and 21 are presently allowed" and that claims 11, 13, 15-20 and 22 would be allowable if they comply with Section 112, 2nd paragraph. (Office Action, at p. 8, Sections 10-11).

As discussed above, independent claim 11 is not indefinite and satisfies 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph, and accordingly claims 11, 13, 15-20 and 22 are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that claims 1-3, 5, 21 and 11, 13, 15-20, 22 (with claims 1 and 11 being independent claims) are allowable. No fees are due with this Response. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, please contact the undersigned at 303-223-1195.

Respectfully submitted,

Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, P.C.

Date: December 31, 2007

By James A. Pinto
James A. Pinto, Attorney Reg. No. 40,774
PH: 303-223-1195
Customer No. 60879

1046715\1107260.1